

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE**

**February 14, 2008**

**1:30 p.m., MST**

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Hearing Room 1 of the Arizona State Senate, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. MST.

**1. Call to Order**

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Dr. John Baracy

Mr. Jim DiCello

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Eileen Klein

Ms. Karen Merritt

Absent:

Dr. Eugene Garcia

Ms. Anna Rosas

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

**2. Approval of December 13, 2007 minutes of Task Force meeting**

Chairman Alan Maguire asked if there were any amendments or edits to the December 13, 2007 Task Force meeting minutes. There were none. Mr. Jim DiCello moved that the minutes be approved. Mrs. Margaret Garcia Dugan seconded the motion. Dr. John Baracy asked to abstain from the vote as he was not present at that meeting. The minutes were approved with one abstention.

**3. Preliminary review and discussion of the Alternate Proposed Models received prior to January 28, 2008**

Chairman Alan Maguire stated that a number of districts had submitted alternate proposed models. According to the procedure adopted by the Task Force, the Task Force conducts a preliminary review of the proposed alternate models within 45 days of submittal, thus the January 28 date. Alternate models received after this date will be reviewed by the Task Force in March. Copies of the proposed models are in the packets. The proposed models were not action items at this meeting. The purpose of this Task Force meeting was to acknowledge receipt and

to review these models as well as to hear from the districts and schools proposing them. The districts and/or schools were not obligated to speak, but were permitted to address the Task Force concerning their proposed models, if they desired to do so. The Task Force was then to openly discuss the proposed model. Presentations were to be limited to about ten minutes.

Ms. Karen Merritt asked if Task Force members could ask questions of the presenters regarding their models. Mr. Maguire stated that this could take place during the open discussion after the presenter's opening remarks.

At least four school districts worked together as the Alpha Schools. Three individuals, Ms. Gloria Rivera from Murphy School District, Deborah Ortiz from Phoenix Elementary School District, and Lilia Montoya from Isaac School District, were present to address any questions the Task Force members might have about their proposed model. Ms. Rivera stated that the schools/school districts in their consortium have a high ELL population of 50% or more. The districts work together as a consortium and holds monthly meetings to address issues related to educating ELL students. Ms. Rivera stated that they tried to follow the requirements of the alternate model guidelines and to respond to the 20-21 questions they received. Dr. John Baracy asked if the questions mentioned referred to the letter from John Stollar to Ms. Ortiz dated January 15, 2008. Ms. Ortiz replied that they were the exact same questions. Dr. Baracy then asked if Cartwright was one of the four school districts proposing an alternate model. Ms. Ortiz stated that Cartwright had not submitted an alternate model.

Dr. Baracy noted that he has heard from school districts that there has been a problem with school districts in trying to fill out estimated costs on the website and asked if this was true. Ms. Rivera stated that there had been some difficulty as the format online was different than what was covered in ADE's training, and the figures were different also. The calculations included desegregation funds and Title I funds, and the school districts had to reexamine these numbers. Dr. Baracy asked Mr. Maguire if these problems with the website have been addressed. Mr. Maguire replied that they will need to be discussed and addressed by Mr. John Stollar (ADE) later in the meeting.

Ms. Merritt asked what the "Pre-AZELLA assessment teams" mentioned on page 7 of the Phoenix Elementary School District proposed alternate model will be like. Ms. Ortiz stated that the teams are groups of people who would assess students to pre-place students before AZELLA results are available for official placement. She stated that the pre-placement is necessary because of the time it takes to receive the results back from the AZELLA. Ms. Ortiz stated that they would probably use the IPT assessment to quickly place students in the appropriate classroom. Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan mentioned a concern about the cost of implementing an additional assessment. Her hope is that the AZELLA results will be returned much more quickly in following years. She mentioned a concern if the school districts who choose to use IPT pay for the implementation of the assessment and then find they do not need the additional assessment with improved turnaround time with AZELLA. Ms. Ortiz stated that their main concern was losing precious instructional time while waiting for results. Ms. Rivera stated she had heard there would soon be a pre-screening tool for AZELLA, but in the meantime, they

needed a tool to correctly place students soon after the start of the school year. Ms. Garcia Dugan said it would be a problem if the state had to pay for more than one assessment tool to place ELL students. She added that if there is a problem in getting the results back in a time then a dialogue will have to occur with Harcourt to ensure a more timely process.

Mr. Jim DiCello asked if the schools proposing this alternate model would be able to estimate the difference in cost between this alternate model and the current Task Force approved models. Ms. Ortiz stated that they could estimate a figure and present it to the Task Force at the next meeting. She stated that in some ways this alternate model is more cost effective, and she didn't believe that the extra costs in assessments would be very significant.

Chariman Maguire stated that ADE recommended that even the schools and districts proposing alternate models should submit a budget request so that the budget request that goes to the legislature would be closer to the real figure and not missing money going to schools with alternate models. Dr. John Baracy asked if there was any funding in the current fiscal year budgeted for the implementation of the ELL models. Mr. John Stollar from ADE stated that Dr. Baracy had asked this question three months ago, and the answer was no. There was no budgeting allocated for the implementation of the ELL program models for the 2007-2008 school year. The budget requests being completed by schools and districts will be for next year's funding.

Mr. Maguire thanked Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Rivera, and Ms. Montoya for coming and presenting, and stated that they would be kept informed of the Task Force's activities regarding their proposed alternative models.

Ms. Patricia Tate, Assistant Superintendent, and Ms. Noemi Cortes, Language Acquisition Specialist, both from Osborn School District, spoke next regarding their proposed alternate model. They had not yet received their questions from ADE but had been told they will be receiving them shortly. They submitted a budget request and received a letter that the budget request had been rejected.

Dr. Baracy asked for more detail about the budget request rejection. There were nine points on the rejection letter, though Ms. Tate did not have a chance to look over the details. She recalled that one point concerned the offset funds including Title I, Title IIA, and desegregation, which they do not receive at their district. She was a little confused by this. She said they emailed ADE to ask for an explanation and will follow up on this. Another point had to do with calculations for teachers. There is an issue with the timetable; they received the rejection yesterday afternoon, and the person they need to contact is out of the office until 1 p.m. for the next few days, yet they must respond by a deadline of tomorrow afternoon. Dr. Baracy asked Mr. Maguire to speak to Mr. Stollar at ADE regarding this issue.

Ms. Merritt asked how the district determined their figures on teachers for next year. Ms. Cortes stated they used the worksheet provided by ADE to calculate their teacher totals. The worksheet has information about students, both the ELL and non-ELL populations. She recalculated by

grade-level what the actual need would be. They wanted to keep class sizes equivalent to present classes. This is where the discrepancies arose. ADE identified schools where a kindergarten teacher needed to be added. The schools use aides in the non-ELD classrooms and wanted to also use aides in the ELD kindergarten classrooms to provide this assistance to teachers. They also need staff to maintain the data to ensure that they are in compliance. These figures were not included in pre-populated fields.

Ms. Cortes and Ms. Tate wanted it noted that their proposed alternate model is significantly less costly. Mr. DiCello asked if there were figures that show the reduced cost. Ms. Cortes stated that there is a cost analysis which has been added to the proposal showing these figures.

Ms. Haver asked if this is a program the district has already been using to any degree. Ms. Tate stated that they adjusted classrooms across the district to address the approved Task Force models as written. After several weeks they ran into some problems with the models, particularly as they did not have the staff to provide smaller class sizes. They wrote the proposed alternate model in an effort to address these problems. They have worked with the local universities to make their alternate model research-based. They believe their model to be the optimal use of resources. The basis of their decision was not money, but opportunities to be offered to children to become proficient in English. This alternative is less costly, but cost was not the reason they developed the alternative model. When they attempted to apply the Task Force model, they achieved mixed results, which varied by school and grade level. In one instance, there was a class of combined Special Ed and ELL students who had different needs. When they pulled out the Special Ed students, the classroom size was too small and created logistic problems. Another problem they encountered was that in not having native English speakers in the classroom, they had difficulties encouraging students to speak English to each other. She offered speakers who could present to the Task Force about their experiences at a future Task Force meeting, including the principal of Cave Creek Elementary School.

Ms. Garcia Dugan asked if they were proposing a dual language program without waivers. Ms. Tate stated that no, in schools that offered a dual language classroom, it would be the parent's choice on whether the child was in an SEI classroom or the dual language classroom. The schools need to respect the parent's choice. Ms. Garcia Dugan clarified that they would need to qualify for the waiver. Ms. Tate agreed.

Dr. Baracy asked about the school district's maximum class size standard. Ms. Tate replied the district maximum is 30 students per classroom. Dr. Baracy then asked about the 2 hours of ELD instruction and the 30 minutes of oral language offered in the SEI classroom, asking where the other 90 minutes of the required four hours of ELD was explained. Ms. Tate stated that it is not four consecutive hours. They cited Superintendent Horne's statement of what they could do in terms of content, and they expanded the ELD into other subjects so that content is being taught with language. They did this because their students are still going to be accountable for the AIMS and they wanted to be sure that they are providing equal access to the content area. Dr. Baracy asked about the figures given in the cost effectiveness study in the K-3 model. Ms. Tate stated that at the point they wrote the model, they had not had the budget request declined. They

propose to have ELL students separated by proficiency but also to have English speaking models in the classroom. This would fit within the budget request amount they had already submitted.

Ms. Heidi Larsen, Compliance Grants Manager from Higley Unified School District, spoke next on behalf of the district's proposed alternative model. Higley is a small school district which has a very high growth rate; last year their growth was over 57%. Their budget request was rejected mere hours ago. They do not have a reading program at the high school and included that in the budget request to get the required materials. They are frustrated because they do not have programs in place that are needed by the law but they need funds in order to set up those programs. The numbers in their budget request reflect their alternate proposed model, which they believe would be more cost effective. They propose holding a class within a class for their low incidence of ELL students instead of combining K-2 for a full SEI classroom. They have not received any questions from ADE regarding their proposed alternative model.

Ms. Garcia Dugan asked how many high schools are in the district. Ms. Larsen stated that there are currently two, with plans to build another high school. Ms. Garcia Dugan asked how many ELL students there are at the high schools. One high school has ten; the other has 23. There are some discrepancies in the number they reported and the current numbers due to their growth. Ms. Merritt asked if the district has grouped kindergarten students with other grades before. Ms. Larsen stated they had not, but they had read research that multi-age classrooms do work and are effective. If they separated kindergarten from other grades they would need an additional teacher. The bulk of their ELL population is in kindergarten. Ms. Merritt asked about the class size for the K-2 grouping. Ms. Larsen stated they would be maintained according to the guidelines set by the Task Force approved models.

Dr. Baracy asked why they considered an alternate model. Ms. Larsen stated it made more sense to group kindergarten with the grades 1-2 because they are all learning phonics. She showed a diagram of the classroom configuration for ELL students. Ms. Larsen said that theirs is a lay-over model: the pre-emergent and emergent students spend the first two hours studying ELD then are joined by the basic to intermediate ELL students to share the next two hours. The basic and intermediate ELL students stay for a final two hours of ELD at their level. This interaction also allows models for the pre-emergent and emergent ELL students. Ms. Garcia Dugan asked about the size of the classrooms. Ms. Larsen stated this would depend on the school; one school might have a larger population of ELL students and have a K-1 grouping of around twenty, while another school might have a smaller ELL population and a K-2 grouping of twenty-three or so, but it would all be within the approved class sizes.

#### **4. Presentation and Discussion of Training Program for School District Personnel on Structured English Immersion Models**

Mr. John Stollar stated that the process to create a new system for processing budget requests has been challenging. He apologized to school districts for any problems and stated that he will try to work with them to find solutions. Since the Task Force approval of the budget forms on November 8th, ADE has been working with their IT department to get the budget form up and

running electronically to make sure that ADE could gather a total figure through an electronic submission to submit an accurate figure to the legislature for a total budget request. ADE opened the website on January 24 and has been working to fix any problems, including navigating the site. People have had numerous problems navigating the site, and ADE has provided case managers to work with the school districts and to help them learn how to navigate the site. By statute, ADE must make sure the budgets are accurate and compliant with the approved models. Additional facilities cannot be included in the budgets.

As ADE staff members review the district budgets, they must comply with statute and the directions of the Task Force. Budget requests were rejected if they contained elements not approved by statute or the Task Force, including the funding for paraprofessionals, facilities, etc. A lot of districts included facilities costs, and these budget requests were automatically rejected. Also rejected were computers. There are about 323 districts and charters eligible for funding. ADE has received submissions from about 75% of this number, 240 submissions. This is an ongoing process. The rejection is not a finality; ADE will work with districts and charters to reach an approved budget. ADE is there to help. Mr. Stollar stated that no one is trying to hurt school districts; but incremental costs are supposed to be costs that are required for the implementation of the model, not an open invitation for a shopping trip for the newest programs that are out there that indeed probably would help children. There's a difference between something that is required and something that would be really nice to have.

Ms. Merritt stated that districts have received rejections and have been given three business days to respond; other districts have not yet received word back from ADE regarding their submissions. Ms. Merritt asked about the process. Mr. Stollar stated that the goal of giving three days for contact was so things could not be dragged out. Mr. Stollar stated that not all districts had received their letters of rejection or acceptance because it takes time to go through the budget requests. If ADE is not contacted by the district within three days, ADE staff members would contact the district to learn what is happening. Ms. Merritt stated she tried to enter more than one e-mail address on the online form and was not able to do so. If she had not changed the e-mail address field, she would not have received the reply.

Ms. Merritt added that she had seen a rejection letter that textbooks would not be accepted as part of the budget request as all materials needed were being supplied by ADE. She understood that the training supplied by ADE was three days and that the materials were the DSI. She knows of districts that develop their own curriculum, which incurs a cost. Other districts purchase special curriculum materials for their ELL students, which incurs a cost. She did not believe that the materials supplied by ADE would cover the entire ELD teaching of four hours a day for an entire school year.

Mr. Stollar stated that ADE assumes that these ELL students have been taught using various curricula for years already, and that the costs associated with the new ELL program would be above and beyond these typical costs. The ELD would be comprised of 90 minutes of teaching the language star parts, as taught by the ADE training sessions with the DSI and other materials. This is the prescribed part of the ELL model already approved by the Task Force. He wanted

clarification from the Task Force on whether the budget requests should include any other non-approved curriculums.

Ms. Merritt commented that Kevin Clark had specifically mentioned that grammar has not been explicitly taught in schools. He gave a training in Tucson, and she had been planning to obtain textbooks for lesson plans concentrating on grammar. She believes this should be included in the costs of the new ELL program. Mr. Maguire read aloud the pertinent section of the budget request form, and stated that his sense of it was that if the average text book cost is one amount, and the cost for an ELL textbook is more, the incremental cost would be the difference in the costs, not the full cost of the text book. Ms. Merritt stated that such an incremental difference would be unlikely; more likely would be that a new set of books would be needed only for ELL students to help teach them specific language skills. In this case, Ms. Merritt stated that the full cost of the textbook should be included.

Mr. Maguire stated if there was a brand new section on English grammar, he assumes that there would be a base curriculum they were being taught before, and then an incremental cost of the new requirement. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated her thoughts were that all students receive certain textbooks. It would be determined what textbooks were needed for the ELD courses and those textbooks would be funded through M& O funds.

Mr. Stollar stated that there often are new editions of textbooks that need to be obtained, or additional teacher's manuals; these are incremental costs. As a principal for 30 years, he sees programs listed on the budget forms which are good programs, but are not required in order to implement the model. He stated that he was approving materials costs that are required, including additional teacher editions and additional software seat licensing costs and if the Task Force wanted him to use a broader interpretation of "required" he could modify his review criteria. Mr. Maguire stated this is essentially what the law guides them to believe. No other members commented.

Mr. Stollar stated that he was rejecting the requests for the costs of textbooks that were ordinary textbook costs for all students because he understood this as the intent of the Task Force. He stated that if he was misinterpreting this issue he could change the guidance provided to the staff that was processing the budget applications. No members of the Task Force offered changes.

Dr. Baracy asked of the 244 submissions received to date, how many have been approved? Mr. Stollar stated that he had just looked at a chart that tells him the status. The approved at this time are probably less than 10 percent. Some are still in review, and some have been rejected. Dr. Baracy asked if the website is fixed. Mr. Stollar stated that it was operational, the best they could make it. Ms. Eileen Klein asked if the ADE training (Round 1B on completing the budget requests) matches what is found on the ADE website (for completing the budget requests). To her, it sounded like the discourse today was about the disconnect between the training and the actual functioning of the website. Mr. Stollar agreed; some things on the website did not operate the way the department had been told they would operate. As ADE staff members discovered these glitches, they developed solutions to help solve the problem. They walked some districts

through the website, screen by screen. Mr. Stollar stated that ADE staff members will assist any district who calls for assistance. Dr. Baracy clarified that the issue was not a disconnect about expenditures that should not be included, but the manner in which calculations were made on the website.

Dr. Baracy wanted to see the rubric methodology in a short format for what was used to accept or reject a budget request from a school district. The law states that ADE would verify for accuracy compliance with the budget request form and then submit the budget to the legislature for funding. Dr. Baracy asked Mr. Stollar if there were some items in proposed budgets that may be deleted, how would that information be communicated to the legislature? Mr. Stollar stated that ADE has been archiving everything, so ADE staff members will have the different submissions for any who want to see them. Dr. Baracy was interested in seeing some of them. Mr. Stollar stated that some of the districts presenting here today had mentioned their rejections. The budget request form online has pre-populated fields. Some districts changed those fields to \$0 and stated that those funds already were pre-allocated or that it is illegal for the state to take any of their Title I funds. The state law requires a certain percentage of these funds to offset the budget request, based on the number of ELL students. Mr. Stollar stated that he would be happy to provide the rubric used to reject or accept budget requests.

Mr. Stollar presented charts showing the number of individuals trained by ADE. Ms. Adela Santa Cruz has been leading the training of ELD instruction, Round 2A. In Tucson, many schools and districts asked for sufficient personnel to attend at least the 3 day initial round of training. ADE has adjusted its training schedule to ensure training of the maximum number of instructors in this first session of ELD instructional training.

Ms. Santa Cruz presented an update on the training of ELD. The ADE instructors are former teachers who have come together to ensure that this most important piece of training will succeed. They have put together a three-day training which will be expanded into an additional four days of training. They began training on January 8 in districts with the most ELLs. Over half of these districts were in Maricopa County and Tucson. As of Friday, February 9, 2008, the ADE training teams had completed the training of the schools and districts with the highest incidence of ELL students and are currently providing training to those schools and districts that have signed up for training on the ADE website.

The ADE training teams instruct 40 educators at a time, including superintendents, principals, teachers, and anyone else who needs to be trained. There were four ADE teams providing training during the initial phase of Round 2A training to the 20 districts with high ELL incidence. Currently, there are two teams providing Round 2A training while they also work on the budget requests. Once the budget request total has been submitted, ADE will resume four teams training Round 2A. The teams start on Tuesday and teach three days, or about 20 hours. By the end of the third day, teachers have expressed an eagerness to begin teaching and a greater acceptance of the curriculum. On the first day, trainers include history and the legal background. Then they discuss the language star and the actual methods of teaching the pieces of language development. Once teachers receive the training, they are ready to teach ELD.



Because of the AIMS test, some areas, including reading and writing, have been taught very well by SEI teachers. Other areas have been more neglected, including listening and speaking. The trainers spend time on activities to get the educators engaged, and they also explain how content can be brought in, but they emphasize that the primary driving focus is language development. The English Language Proficiency Standards have been simplified and turned into a tool (*Teachers' Guides*) to help educators teach students. The three-day training is only the beginning. The next round of ELD training probably will occur in summer and use lessons learned through the first part of the Round 2A training.

Ms. Klein asked Mr. Stollar how comprehensive Round 2A is: does it teach all of the necessary skills for teachers to teach ELD? Mr. Stollar stated that it is a portion of the full training, or about 20 hours of the planned 45 hours. Mr. Stollar stated that there are districts that have the expertise to continue training their own teachers. ADE plans to partner with those districts. District trainers will take the framework for the remaining four days and tell ADE how they will meet that framework. Then, they will be able to offer those additional four days to their educators.

Ms. Klein asked for confirmation that the training schedule has slowed somewhat because of the influx of budget request forms. She had expected ADE department staff members to be concentrating on training or budget requests, so that teams would not have to be pulled from giving training sessions in order to help with the budget request forms. She asked for clarification of the various staff positions. Mr. Stollar stated it is a composite of teachers training who also have the necessary skills to review budget requests and revisions. With 244 budget requests coming into ADE in a short space of time, it was more prudent to use some of the training staff to help review the budget request forms. Ms. Klein asked how many people will have participated in the training by August. Mr. Stollar stated this would take some time to calculate as they would have to look at the numbers already trained and project future estimations. He has excellent figures for two school districts concerning which they are training and will probably obtain more information from other districts. Ms. Klein commented that it would be helpful to have these estimations, as currently the numbers suggest that only an average of one person per school has been trained. Mr. Stollar added that after the budget requests are submitted, schools and districts will have come to an agreement on how many sections of ELD are going to be required and thus how many teachers need to be trained before the next school year.

## **5. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities**

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that the next few Task Force meetings will likely be similar to today in hearing alternate proposed models and updates on the training and budget requests. He appreciated everyone's involvement in this exercise. The Task Force had to create a model that was defined by a very rigorous law, and then they had to create a budget request form based on this approved model. They tried to do this in a timely manner, recognizing that the legislative

and state appropriation processes do not stop. The Task Force pushed the Department of Education very hard to move from the budget form to an automated online budget form, knowing that this would also push school districts to make a very harsh deadline, but this was done in order not to miss the deadline to submit the budget request to the legislature and the appropriations committee.

Mr. Maguire would like another discussion about the training, an update on the budget request, several more alternate proposed models, and depending upon the dialogue between ADE and the school districts, possibly full presentations of some alternative proposed models to the Task Force.

## **6. Call to the Public**

A call to the public was made at 2:38 p.m. There were three public speakers.

First to speak was Ms. Barbara Valencia-Ortega from the Scottsdale USD. The district has both a high ELL count and also low count schools. The district is considering using the ILLP for the low count schools. The statute states for ELLs to achieve English proficiency in a period “not normally intended to exceed one year,” but her staff has looked at the statute and there is some discrepancy in the wording. She would like the Task Force to look again at the wording and clarify the wording in the model. Clarification of any statute discrepancies related to the “not normally intended to exceed one year” language would remove a lot of the anxiety about getting that form signed by principals and teachers at the bottom of the ILLP. Mr. Alan Maguire stated he would look at it.

Mr. Andrew Morrill, Vice President at Arizona Education Association, spoke next. He expressed hope that the Task Force takes the opportunities to listen to ideas on alternate models as a chance to listen to how things are working in the field, and what ideas the field has come up with to generate a successful model. He hopes every latitude possible will be given to districts in reviewing these proposed alternate models. He had a few questions, including what the deadline will be to turn in the budget requests to the legislature. He had heard that the form is asking for dual calculations, one with the federal funding included and one with the federal funding excluded. He didn't know what the clarification has been; one of these has had a court ruling but is in conflict with the law. Because one of the calculations is out of compliance with the court order, Mr. Morrill asked which figure is being considered to be sent to the legislature, as well as if these calculations have had any effect on whether the budget request has been approved or rejected. Last, he noted that there is a requirement in the Task Force approved model that says Grade 7 through 12 teachers must have a secondary English certificate. There is a current State Board Rule that Grade 7 through 12 teachers must acquire English as an area through an approved means. The language in the model seems to be in contradiction to the language in the State Board Rules. If the Task Force would like clarification on this, he can provide it.

Last, Ms. Sheryl Green, Laveen Elementary School District, addressed the Task Force. Ms. Green stated that the Laveen District has been using the standard textbook with an ELL supplement in their classrooms and has found that this is probably not as big a piece as they need to cover the DSI. The Laveen District asked for textbooks to ensure that there is enough of an ELD program to cover the time. They purchased language arts textbooks two or three years ago, and cannot return them. Therefore, incremental costs don't really work, because they need two books per child: the standard language arts textbook and the special ELD book. It isn't possible to subtract one cost from the other. There was some confusion in contacting her case manager at ADE because she was out doing the trainings. Ms. Green wished to thank Ms. Marlene Johnston for her assistance in working with the budget request. In the future, she hopes that the time factor will take into account that some of the case managers are in the field and unable to be contacted.

Last, she understands that certain signatures are required, but because of the many changes in their district, including a 30% increase in population, it is very hard to agree and sign a paper that is not accurate. The numbers of teachers and students did not reflect actual numbers. A school which was supposed to take students did not open, and the students were dispersed among the other schools. Some students are being double-counted and others are not being counted. The final numbers are too low. She added that her district's budget request did include facilities, knowing this was not allowed, because they wanted the legislature to know that this cost should be included when a district is mandated to group students in a certain manner and when they have a 30% growth of new student enrollments. The district needs the legislature to understand what they need. The Laveen District is not ready to receive Round 2A training because they do not know who all the teachers will be; they will need to hire new teachers. She hopes that ADE keeps Round 2A training going for a long enough period to handle cases like this.

## **7. Discussion of future meetings**

The next ELL Task Force meeting is expected to be held on March 13, and the following meeting on April 10.

## **8. Adjournment**

The motion was made by Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan to adjourn the meeting; the motion was seconded by Ms. Karen Merritt. The meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

## **Arizona ELL Task Force**

Alan Maguire, Chairman  
April 10, 2008